



MARKSCHEME

May 2000

HISTORY - EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

Notes on Individual Questions

These must be read in conjunction with current mark bands.

1. To what extent were weaknesses of the French Monarchy responsible for the outbreak of revolution in France in 1789?

Some suggested areas of weakness to consider are financial, the feudal system, political - including the failure to call the States General, consult, etc., the personality of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette.

A general or brief survey of all the causes probably would not reach *[8 marks]*; narrative or descriptive answers focused on the monarchy *[8 to 10 marks]*, or *[11 to 13 marks]* with appropriate comments, *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher for analytical structural answers and for those who do assess to what extent by evaluating other causes briefly. But the focus of the question is the French Monarchy so candidates who dismiss it as a cause of the French Revolution and then describe other causes cannot score *[8 marks]*.

2. What part did Napoleon I's policies play in his fall from power in 1814?

Candidates need to consider both Napoleon's policies which weakened France - especially financially and led to his unpopularity, such as his ambitious foreign policies including Spain and Russia; the drain of this continuous conflict, in men and money; the decline of support from the French middle class; and other factors including the resistance of Russia and Britain, the resurgence of Prussia and final allied effort and determination to defeat Napoleon, who did fall from power as a result of military defeat.

Narrative accounts will score according to their detail, accuracy and comments, probably up to *[11 to 13 marks]*, and structured essays with assessment *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher with real analysis of Napoleon's mistakes, failures, over reaching *etc.* and the part played by his enemies with some judgement as to which was more responsible for his fall.

3. Evaluate the extent to which Metternich achieved his aims for Austria and for Europe.

Candidates will probably know less about Austria, than Europe, but reserve at least *[6 marks]* for Austria which he aimed to preserve, but he failed to reform the imperial institutions or to accommodate national aspirations. For Europe they should evaluate in some depth his aims at Vienna, the Congress System and Holy Alliance.

Narrative / descriptive essays which do tackle both areas could score up to *[13 marks]* as long as they contain at least some explicit comments. *[14+ marks]* answers will be more focused on aims, structured and analytical, with the top marks for those answers which state his aims and evaluate how far he achieved them. Better candidates should realise that he was not as reactionary as his Emperor, and did carry out some reforms in the Empire.

4. How far is it true to say that ‘Louis XVIII’s polices proved that the Bourbon restoration in France could work, the polices of Charles X ensured it would fail.’

Candidates need to evaluate the reign of Louis XVIII and assess the situation at his death. In his favour they could consider the Charter, Louis’ willingness to accept limits to his power, and a limited parliamentary system, the economic revival and land settlement. But opposed to this was the position of the Church and émigrés (White Terror) and the murder of the Duc de Berry. Better candidates at least will give a verdict on the state of the monarchy when Charles X succeeded to the throne and most should be able to show how Charles’ policies aimed to restore the crown’s authority, *e.g.* the Ordanances of St Cloud, led to the downfall of the Bourbons.

Marks will depend on balanced coverage of both reigns - perhaps up to **[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative plus some assessment, higher, **[14 to 16 marks]** for focus, structure and analysis. The top marks **[17+ marks]** will cover these skills with perhaps the identification of long term issues which had not been solved, by the restoration.

5. Account for the outbreak of any *two* revolutions in 1848 and assess their results.

Any two revolutions in 1848 can be chosen, and Italy can be used as a whole for one, or the different areas could count as two. For the outbreak both long term factors, *i.e.* constitutional demands, economic factors, population growth, and short term ones, the economic crisis and the particular triggers should be covered. The results will depend on the examples chosen, but they were often minimal at least on the surface. Credit but do not demand longer term results such as the lessons learnt from the failure of the 1848 Revolutions in Italy by later Italian statesmen and others. If only one revolution is tackled, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

6. Analyse the aims, motives and polices of Cavour between 1852 and 1861.

Aims could include Piedmontese expansion and / or Italian Unification: motives might consider national feeling, personal power, fear of revolution, fear of Austria. Policies should cover at least some of the following: modernisation of Piedmont, Crimea, relations with France; opposition to and war with Austria, plebisites, relations with Garibaldi. It is hoped that the wording of the question will encourage candidates to structure their answers in the format offered.

Provided the knowledge is sufficient and accurate this structure should score **[11 to 13 marks]** and higher, leaving the lower marks for those who continue to narrate Cavour’s career with no focus on the set question. Probably those who offer different interpretations of Cavour’s aims and motives will score very well, such as **[17+ marks]**.

7. Compare and contrast Bismarck's policies towards Austria and France between 1862 and 1871.

Bismarck's policy of excluding Austria from KleinDeutschland involved humiliating her militarily, but Bismarck did not take Habsburg territory. Fighting Austria required French neutrality, which he was able to achieve. Better answers will see that Napoleon III was not a passive partner in the ensuring diplomatic manoeuvres and helped convince Bismarck that a striking success against France was needed. When the war against France was won, the Treaty of Frankfurt was harsher than the terms imposed upon Austria earlier - good answers will point this out and suggest why.

The best answers will understand the relevance of the question to interpretations about Bismarck's aims and should reach *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher. Descriptive / end on comparisons will only reach *[11 to 13 marks]* with good linkage, and *[8 to 10 marks]* without. If only Austria or France is considered *[8 marks]* cannot be reached.

8. In what ways did the domestic and foreign policies of Disraeli benefit Britain?

Probably candidates will concentrate on Disraeli's ministry, 1874 to 1878 with his social reforms, foreign and imperial policy aimed to maintain Britain as a major European power, and his relations with Victoria, however it is hoped that they will evaluate his attitude to parliamentary reform, 1866 to 1867, which ensured the enfranchisement of a significant sector of the working class. His efforts to remodel the Conservative Party - which probably was responsible for its election in 1874 is also very relevant.

Marks should depend on accuracy and coverage. Those who do analyse how far his work did benefit Britain - or the reverse, will score very well, *[14 to 16 marks]* or higher, with narrative descriptive accounts of 1874 to 1878 probably *[8 to 10 marks]* but *[11 to 13 marks]* if evaluation is included.

9. How far is it true to say that Russia was transformed into a modern country between 1855 and 1900?

For agreement Alexander II's reforms could be a starting point, especially in relation to emancipation, the army, education, the judiciary and local government. This could be followed by Witte's policies at the end of the century, especially industrialisation and railways. To refute the idea that Russia was a 'modern' country by 1900 the limits and failures of Alexander's reforms, especially in the political sphere - no national Duma or representation - censorship, regression in education, arbitrary arrest, the economy still underdeveloped, should be addressed; there was poverty and distress in towns and countryside as well as repression.

Balanced answers, especially those which note different interpretations will score *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher; also reward those who tackle both the economic and political issues. Those who limit their answers to the reign of Alexander II should probably not score above *[13 marks]*.

10. How important was the search for raw materials and new markets as a reason for European imperialism?

Candidates could express agreement with the British in India, the African situation, with both as areas of new resources and potential markets. There were 'gold rushes' in Australia and the Yukon. Against this could be argued that trade patterns with the United States were more important than European colonies as markets, the lack of resources to develop colonies, and the importance of political rivalries and strategic concerns which were usually more important factors in imperialism than economic considerations.

Unsubstantiated generalisations will not reach **[8 marks]** but answers with specific detail, data of volume of trade *etc.*, will score well, **[14 to 16 marks]** and higher.

11. To what extent, and with what results, did Napoleon III liberalise the Second Empire in France?

The extents / measures could include political changes, the legislative body was given more responsibility, the easing of censorship, trade unions legalised, 1859 amnesty *etc.* Against this Napoleon III remained head of government with significant powers. Results could consider growing political opposition, and the pressure towards an unwise foreign policy culminating with Bismarck's defeat of Napoleon III.

Narrative answers which contain satisfactory details would score **[8 to 10 marks]**, or **[11 to 13 marks]** with some assessment. Those which focus on liberalisation and results will score **[14 to 16 marks]** or higher, **[17+ marks]** with perceptive analysis. Better candidates could point out that Napoleon's defeat by Bismarck had probably nothing to do with liberalisation.

12. Discuss the changing relations between either Sweden and Norway or Finland and Russia in the nineteenth century.

Considerations of why the states were united in the early nineteenth century, developments during the century (*e.g.* Russification) the growth of cultural nationalism, and the reasons for separation, would be appropriate.

Marks will depend on depth and detail, with **[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative chronological essays, but **[11 to 13 marks]** if assessment is included and **[14+ marks]** for structured answers.

13. Account for the popularity of the novel in nineteenth century Europe.

Some ideas which could be explored are increasing literacy, social concerns and the novel as a social commentary, more leisure and money for the middle classes, literacy movements and developments, serialisation in newspapers, printing technology and improved communications.

Reward specific references to novelists, originality and wide coverage, with probably **[14 to 16 marks]** and higher. Short general answers will probably not reach **[8 marks]**.

14. In what ways did the crises and political scandals in France both weaken and strengthen the Third Republic between 1880 and 1905?

Focus could be Boulanger, Panama and Dreyfus, weakening with political division, social and religious tensions, and anti-Semitism, and strengthening with more democracy, the emergence of a new breed of politicians such as Clemenceau, the weakening of the influence of Church and army hence the strengthening of the state.

Narratives alone might not reach *[8 marks]*, but with some comments *[8 to 10 marks]*, but at least implicit assessment is needed for *[11 to 13 marks]*. Those answers which focus on strength and weakness with some depth of analysis will score *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher.

15. Compare and contrast the causes of the 1905 and February/March 1917 revolutions in Russia.

For comparison; Tsarism, its weaknesses, failures, personality of the Tsar; failure and defeat in war, against Japan 1905 and in World War One 1914 to 1917; opposition and criticism; desire for more political participation, 1905 for a Duma, 1917 for a 'freer' Duma.

For contrast: Support of the army 1905, great opposition 1917; state of the economy, weak 1905, some improvement since 1905, but collapse in war; aims organisation and cohesion of opposition strengthened by 1917.

A comparative structure will probably score better say *[14 to 16 marks]* than end on accounts *[8 to 10 marks]*, with very good linkage, *[11 to 13 marks]*. If only one revolution is addressed *[8 marks]* cannot be reached.

16. 'The Versailles Treaty was criticised by both winners and losers.' How justified was this criticism?

Criticism by Germany and other 'losers' could include the 'Diktat' (Germany not consulted); scale of restorations; territorial losses; disarmament; by the allies (winners), that the Treaty was not sufficiently severe and long term stability was not achieved. For justification of the criticisms Hitler, Mussolini, failure of League of Nations could be mentioned.

In favour of the Treaty: the scale of damage in France and Belgium; Brest-Litvosk; non-Germans created new nations; speed of German recovery, therefore the criticism was not justified.

Those who narrate what they consider was wrong with the Treaty will probably score *[8 to 10 marks]* and *[11 to 13 marks]* with assessment. Essays worth *[14 to 16 marks]* will be balanced and focused on 'justified' and 'criticism'.

17. What were the political and economic successes and failures of the Weimar Republic?

Successes could include and consider the constitution; extent of democracy; survival for ten years; Stresemann; European and United States co-operation; financial recovery. Failures could include it failed to establish or make acceptable democracy amongst politicians or the electorate; finance, especially 1924; rise of extremism, Nazis; Hitler; political crisis 1930 to 1932.

Narrative essays will probably score *[8 to 10 marks]*, or *[11 to 13 marks]* with considered comments. Structured essays especially those which analyse the importance of outside factors will probably score *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher.

18. Why did the history of Italy from 1900 to 1922 lead to the rise of Mussolini and the establishment of a Fascist Regime?

The rise of Mussolini occurred because of the failures of the Italian political system; party divisions; impact of World War One and peace settlement; social and economic problems; personality of Mussolini; as well as the failure to eliminate regional divisions with unification in 1871. Mussolini was appointed Prime Minister in 1922 and established a Fascist Regime through the use of violence, intimidation, propaganda, legislation and appeal to the people with 'populist' and other measures - by about 1928-29. The question suggests that he was able to do this because of Italian disappointment with events, policies, *etc.*, 1900 to 1922, thus Mussolini's policies should be contrasted or weighed against these.

Limited narratives will probably score below *[8 marks]* or *[8 to 10 marks]* those which cover the full period *[11 to 13 marks]* with at least implicit assessment, and structured answers *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher with perceptive analysis.

19. What was the impact of the Wall Street Crash upon any *one* European country (excluding Germany) up to 1939?

Candidates should understand impact to cover economic, social and political spheres, but these must be linked, through the depression with the Wall Street Crash. Short and long term effects would both be relevant, with a terminal date of 1939.

Answers which do not refer to specific details from one country would not score *[8 marks]*, narratives of the time period would probably score *[8 to 10 marks]* or *[11 to 13 marks]* depending on comment and assessment. Structured, detailed and specific answers would, if accurate and analytical score, *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher.

20. Explain why Franco's forces won the Spanish Civil War, and why the Republican forces lost.

An assessment of the reasons for the success of Franco's forces is needed, such as leadership; support of the Church and other sectors of the population; foreign support - from Italy and Germany and the prohibition by the League / international agreement to avoid involvement; tactics; and disunity problems of the Republican forces, rather than a narrative account or description of the war. However, events in the war should be given as evidence for the above points.

A chronological account would score *[8 to 10 marks]* with some basic explanation for Franco's success *etc.*, *[11 to 13 marks]* with better explanation and *[14 to 16 marks]* or higher when structured and analytical.

21. Why, and with what results, was the policy of appeasement adopted by Britain and France in the 1930s?

'Why' could include the desire to avoid war after the crippling experience of World War One; the economic and financial state of Britain and France; doubts about the Versailles Treaty; the need for time to replenish armaments; pacifist movements; Britain's imperial commitments. Results which could be included or at least discussed are: Abyssinian Crisis; German rearmament; Rhineland; Austria; Sudetenland; Czechoslovakia; Munich; Nazi-Soviet Pact; Poland; outbreak of World War Two.

Narrative answers will probably score *[8 to 10 marks]* or *[11 to 13 marks]*, but chronological accounts with **explicit assessment throughout**, could reach the top bands.

22. Compare the Cold War policies of Stalin and Khrushchev from 1945 to 1964.

The policies of both Stalin and Khrushchev in the Cold War years for comparison could be: their treatment of the Eastern European Satellite States; arms race with the United States including the atom bomb; missiles; Cuba; the question of Berlin; diplomacy; efforts to woo non-aligned countries, *etc.* Some candidates may legitimately confine their answers to comparisons; abler candidates may also point out the differences in their policies and the onset of peaceful coexistence.

If only Stalin or Khrushchev are tackled *[8 marks]* cannot be reached. Narrative accounts of the period 1945 to 1964 will probably score *[8 to 10 marks]*, but *[11 to 13 marks]* with good comparative comments. Comparative structured answers with adequate detail and assessment would score *[14 to 16 marks]* and higher.

23. Explain how any *one* western European state recovered from the devastation of the Second World War.

Political, economic and social measures with the named and chosen country would be relevant - and necessary for a good answer. The regional and international dimensions should also be addressed, *i.e.* Marsall Aid, OEEC and other forms and organisation devoted to co-operation with other states, as relevant. For 'Western' allow any European state that did not belong to the Eastern block. Marks will be depend on depth and detail; narratives / chronological accounts probably scoring **[8 to 10 marks]** or **[11 to 13 marks]** but structured analytical answers with specific and focused detail **[14 to 16 marks]** or higher.

24. What factors led to the collapse of Communist domination in Eastern Europe by 1990?

The question says by 1990 but does not give a date to begin, as many of the factors were long term, with opposition gaining momentum with time and the deterioration of conditions, especially as the standard of living in the West was seen to improve. Some points to consider would be: economic stagnation; low standard of living; resultant popular disaffection; Gorbachev era and changing attitude of the USSR; growth and increasing strength of opposition movements, *i.e.* mass movements (Solidarity movement in Poland) intellectual movements (Czechoslovakia); western support and encouragement for dissent. The focus must be on Eastern Europe and the USSR policy towards it but allow some credit for the USSR internal situation before Gorbachev if made relevant.

General assertions with no specific material to support them would probably not reach **[8 marks]**, plus some more specific narrative **[8 to 10 marks]** and clear accounts of factors, and structured essays, **[11 to 13 marks]** and **[14 to 16 marks]**. Excellent balance or for example historiography could score **[17+ marks]**.

25. 'A revolution.' How accurately does this describe changes in transport in twentieth century Europe?

'A revolution!' How revolutionary have transport advances, changes *etc.* been in the twentieth century? Most candidates will probably emphasis the advances made in air travel but also important is the increase in car ownership. To obtain a good mark, **[11 to 13 marks]** and above, the economic and social aspects must be considered, *e.g.* for business, holidays and food - even the viability of the IB exams - with air travel and freight. What are the social implications of car ownership for leisure and work patterns? The downside and disadvantages which come with any revolution must be considered for **[14 to 16 mark]** answers; unemployment with the decline of shipping and shipbuilding; the decline of public transport; trains and buses, which affects the poor. The ideas which could feed this answer are legion. Reward initiative and original thinking, but unsubstantiated general comments about unnamed countries would not reach **[8 marks]**.
